

marketing of programming, reduce technical problems, and stabilize the pricing of satellite time.

Federal backing of such a system will not only heighten the educational opportunities for our children, but it will also benefit State and local educational agencies by ultimately reducing their expenses for satellite services and equipment. Further, while distance learning can never replace classroom teachers, it does provide educators with an additional tool with which to teach.

This is just the first step and certainly not the only answer to solving the problems that schools face in using satellites. However, I believe that it is an important step for the Federal Government to take to help encourage the use of technology in the education sector. Improving the accessibility and quality of education will help our children and our national economy as a whole to become stronger and more competitive in the global marketplace.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH DISTANCE LEARNING THROUGH SATELLITE TECHNOLOGY

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1995

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, America's distance education programs are in jeopardy. Escalating costs and a decline in the availability of satellite capacity are putting distance learning programs across the country at risk.

The distance education industry in the United States provides a much needed service to health facilities and schools in hard-to-reach areas. More than 90 American colleges provide education and instruction to school districts, colleges, and libraries, nationally and internationally. If we do not address the shortage in satellite capacity and the increased costs, these programs will be curtailed.

The legislation that I am introducing today would create an adequate satellite system dedicated to education. My bill would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to carry out a loan guarantee program under which a non-profit, public corporation could borrow funds to buy or lease satellites dedicated to instructional programming. Distance learning programs, which are now scattered across numerous satellites, could be collocated into one satellite. This will facilitate access to educational programming, reduce technical problems, and stabilize costs.

A satellite dedicated to education is an obvious way to improve educational opportunities for all Americans. An education satellite would afford students a high quality of education regardless of where they live or how much money they make.

An education satellite will enable students in rural America to take advanced placement chemistry, even though their school district does not have an advanced chemistry teacher. An education satellite will ensure that hearing-impaired students will have access to instructors that are certified in sign language. An education satellite will excite young minds and bring the finest instructors to our inner cities, where they are most needed.

I have long supported the establishment of an education satellite through my involvement

with the Education Satellite Corp. [EDSAT], a subsidiary of the nonprofit National Education Telecommunications Organization [NETO]. This organization has been working to enhance educational opportunities for our Nation's students through distance learning technology.

Other countries have education satellites. Japan and Great Britain recognize the important role that television plays in education. Japan relies heavily on in-school use of television to education children, and the British require all stations, commercial and noncommercial, to carry educational and informative programming for children.

An education satellite is in the Nation's best interest. A satellite-based infrastructure dedicated to education will bring equity to our educational system. While distance learning will never replace classroom teachers, it does provide educators with an additional tool with which to teach. An education satellite will afford all Americans the opportunity they deserve to achieve their fullest potential.

PROTECT CALIFORNIA'S ECONOMY AND BEAUTY: KEEP THE BAN ON OFFSHORE OIL DRILLING

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1995

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, for more than 14 years, Californians have enjoyed protection from the dangers of offshore oil drilling. It is imperative that the moratorium on offshore oil drilling be extended permanently.

This is an issue on which all Californians agree:

First, local, State, and Federal elected officials support the ban: I have been contacted by Governor Wilson, our representatives in the State legislature, and our local city councils in support of extending the ban.

Second, business and environmentalist leaders support the ban: at a recent press conference in San Diego, business, environmental, and tourism officials came together to indicate their support for the permanent extension of the ban on offshore oil drilling.

Third, the voters of San Diego agree: in 1986, more than 75 percent of San Diegans voted in favor of a ban on offshore oil drilling within 100 miles of our coast.

Our key concern is the devastation that oil drilling would cause to San Diego's \$3.6 billion-a-year tourism industry! Quite frankly, the small amount of oil that some people guess is available in our kelp beds is simply not worth the damage to our economy that offshore oil drilling would cause.

We all know—no matter how careful we are—accidents happen. We cannot—we will not—accept the risk of offshore oil drilling so that a few large oil companies can add to their wealth. We will not allow the economic and environmental damage caused in Santa Barbara, Prince William Sound, or the Gulf of Mexico to be repeated anywhere on California's coast.

We urge this Congress to act now and protect California's economy and beauty—extend the ban on offshore oil drilling permanently.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT REFORM ACT OF 1995

HON. JOHN T. DOOLITTLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1995

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, today, we are fulfilling another important part of our Contract With America; to bring Government to the people, to respond to their concerns on a bipartisan basis, to make Government more efficient. I have been contacted by members of the public from all sides of the political spectrum to address the issues of CVPIA implementation. There is general agreement that we must break new ground to improve our water management in California. Members on both sides of the aisle are here today to support new ways to approach these problems.

In 1992, Congress passed the Central Valley Project Improvement Act, which substantially altered the way water is managed in California. Among its major provisions, the CVPIA provided for 800,000 acre-feet of water from the CVP to be primarily dedicated to fish and wildlife. It also established the CVP restoration fund and assessed charges against both water and power interests into the fund.

We have spoken with a number of our constituents in California, including irrigation districts, municipalities, environmental organizations and power customers who have expressed concerns about the way certain provisions of the CVPIA are being implemented or interpreted. They would like to see these issues addressed.

It has become increasingly apparent that there are some provisions of the CVPIA that need modification. At the same time, there is recognition by all the parties that now is not the time for radical changes in the act, but rather, for well thought out improvements which ensure that the basic principles of the act are achieved in a manner which meets the real needs of the parties concerned. This bill provides reasonable and badly needed reforms. It also clarifies and builds on the Bay-Delta accord. It will ensure that there is no double-counting of the 800,000 acre-feet of water devoted to environmental programs under the original CVPIA.

Finally, we are returning common sense to the CVPIA in the area of water pricing. It was the stated intent of the CVPIA to create greater incentives for the conservation of water. Implementation of the act discouraged some good water practices. For instance, there are areas served by the Central Valley Project where there is significant overdraft of the aquifers. We need to provide opportunities for the recharge of underground aquifers. Tiered pricing was designed to charge higher prices as more water is used. In a year such as this, when we have significant amounts of water in California, it is foolish to have a policy that discourages a water district from recharging its aquifer.

The reforms we propose today are balanced. They address common sense issues which must be changed. It is a bipartisan bill which will improve California's ability to manage its water.